

REMARKS

Upon entry of this Response, claims 1-131 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 7, 30, 49, 68, 89, and 114 have been amended. Claim 132 has been cancelled. Applicants request reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

As an initial matter, Applicants first wish to express sincere appreciation for the time that Examiner Bashore spent with Applicant's representative during an August 1, 2007 telephone discussion regarding the above-identified Office Action. During the interview, various features described in the patent application and recited in the claims, including the 35 USC § 112 rejection were discussed, and the outcome of the discussion is addressed herein. Applicants believe that the amendments presented herein are consistent with the overall discussion with Examiner Bashore. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner Bayshore carefully consider this amendment and response.

In item 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 7, 30, 49, 68, 89, and 114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §251 as being broadened in the reissue application filed outside the two year statutory limit. Applicants note that claims 1, 7, 30, 49, 68, 89, and 114 have been amended to overcome this objection. Applicants assert that the amendment clarifies the claim language without broadening as the claims retain the same meaning as can be determined from the Responses to the Office Actions of October 9, 1991 and May 13, 1992 in the file history of the parent. In addition, claims 1, 7, 30, 49, 68, 89, and 114 have been narrowed by automatically assigning or associating tiles and objects in response to the user command to display a form. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1, 7, 30, 49, 68, 89, and 114 under 35 U.S.C. §251 be withdrawn.

In item 6 of the Office Action, claims 1-132 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, it is alleged that the following interpretation for independent claims 1, 7, 30, 49, 68, 89, 114, and 132 (and all dependent claims by virtue of reliance to their respective base claims) is not supported in the instant specification: "assigning a plurality of tiles to each of said objects ...". In response to the rejection, Applicants note that claims 1, 7, 30, 49, 68, 89, and 114 have been amended to overcome this objection. In addition, claim 132 has been cancelled. As such, Applicant submits that the instant specification teaches assigning one of a plurality of tiles to each object.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1-132 under 35 U.S.C. §112 be withdrawn.

In item 8 of the Office Action, independent claims 1, 7, 30, 89, 114, 132 and dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-15, 18-26, 28-29, 31-32, 37-45, 47-48, 90-97, 101-110, 112-113, 115-117, 119-128, 130-131 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over “Using 1-2-3 Special Edition.” In response to the rejection, Applicants note that claims 1, 7, 30, 49, 68, 89, and 114 have been amended to overcome this objection. Claims 1, 7, 30, 89, and 114 have been amended to have the processing means automatically assign or associate tiles and objects in response to the user command to display a form. Also, claim 132 has been cancelled. In addition, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-15, 18-26, 28-29, 31-32, 37-45, 47-48, 90-97, 101-110, 112-113, 115-117, 119-128, 130-131 be withdrawn as depending from independent claims 1, 7, 30, 89, or 114. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of independent claims 1, 7, 30, 89, 114, 132 and dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-15, 18-26, 28-29, 31-32, 37-45, 47-48, 90-97, 101-110, 112-113, 115-117, 119-128, 130-131 under 35 U.S.C. §112 be withdrawn.

In item 9 of the Office Action, independent claims 49, 68 and dependent claims 13, 17, 27, 36, 46, 50-51, 55-67, 69-72, 76-88, 101, 111, 119, 129 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over “Using 1-2-3 Special Edition” in view of Cobb et al., “Excel In Business.” A prima facie case of obviousness is established only when the prior art teaches or suggests all of the elements of the claims. MPEP §2143.03, In re Rijkcaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 28 U.S.P.Q2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Applicants assert that amended claims 49 and 68 are in condition for allowance for the same reasons described above with respect to amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of independent claims 49 and 68 be withdrawn. In addition, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 13, 17, 27, 36, 46, 50-51, 55-67, 69-72, 76-88, 101, 111, 119, 129 be withdrawn as depending from independent claims 1, 30, 49, 68, 89, or 114.

In item 10 of the Office Action, claims 16, 33-35, 98-100, and 118 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over “Using 1-2-3 Special Edition” in view of McDonald et al., “The Benefits of Automated Medical Record Systems For Ambulatory Care.” Claims 16, 33-35, 98-100, and 118 depend from independent claims 1, 30, 89, and 114, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 16, 33-35, 98-100, and

118 be withdrawn as depending from claims 1, 30, 89, and 114 for the same reasons described above with respect to claims 1, 30, 89, and 114.

In item 11 of the Office Action, dependent claims 52-54 and 73-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over “Using 1-2-3 Special Edition” in view of Cobb et al., “Excel In Business,” and further in view of McDonald et al., “The Benefits of Automated Medical Record Systems For Ambulatory Care.” Claims 52-54 and 73-75 depend from independent claims 49 and 68. Applicants request that the rejection of claims 52-54 and 73-75 be withdrawn as depending from claims 49 and 68 for the reasons described above with respect to claims 49 and 69.

CONCLUSION

It is requested that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and all presently pending claims be allowed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this Response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned counsel of Applicants.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. D'Aurelio/

Michael J. D'Aurelio
Registration Number: 40,977

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, L.L.P.

100 Galleria Parkway, N.W.

Suite 1750

Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948

Phone: (770) 933-9500

Fax: (770) 951-0933